





The Commonwealth, of Boston, recently published the following item in relation to Sims:—

“We learn that Sims had received one flogging of thirty-nine stripes, the extent allowed by the law, and was to receive another, for the crime of running away from Mr. James Potter. He was promised that the last flogging should be remitted, if he would ask Mr. Potter's forgiveness for the offence, but he refused.”

If this were told of some Hungarian refugee, who had been recaptured and put under the Austrian knout, the country would ring with admiration for the hero, and with execration of his tyrannical captors.



BARNSTABLE COUNTY CONVENTION.

This Convention met at Harwich, in the Grove near Union Hall, on Friday morning, Aug. 29. Samuel May Jr., was chosen Chairman pro tem., and B. F. Robbins, Secretary.

Voted, That a Committee be now raised, whose duty it shall be to report, at the opening of the afternoon meeting, a list of officers for the Convention. Voted, That this Committee be nominated by the Chair.

The Chair nominated the following persons to serve as said Committee, and they were chosen:— Samuel Smith, of Harwich; Joshua H. Robbins, of Harwich; John Gurnham, of Dennis; and Austin Barnes, of Boston.

An hour was spent in general consultation upon the case.

Adjourned to 2 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION. Met according to adjournment.

The Committee appointed in the morning, reported, as follows, the names of persons for officers of the meeting:—

For President,  
Ezekiel Thatcher, of Barnstable.

Vice Presidents,  
Zebina H. Small, of Harwich;  
Cyrus Howes, of East Dennis;  
Phyllander Paine, of Brewster;  
Samuel Smith, of Harwich;  
Prince S. Crowell, of E. Dennis;  
Alvan Howes, of Barnstable;  
Job Kelley, of Dennis;  
Dane Kelley, of Dennis;  
Silvanus Jagger, of Centerville.

Secretaries,  
Samuel May, Jr., George W. Putnam.

Business Committee,  
William L. Garrison, Stephen S. Foster,  
Gilbert Smith, Varanus Nickerson,  
Elisha Robbins, Hiram Beare,  
Sarah E. S. Robbins, Caroline Hinckley.

Financial Committee,  
Joshua H. Robbins, Benj. F. Robbins,  
John Gurnham, Nathl. Robbins,  
Phyllander Paine, Benj. F. Small.

A hymn was sung.

Samuel May, Jr., read passages of Scripture appropriate to the objects of the Convention.

S. May, Jr., addressed the Convention, in some remarks, opening the subject which the Convention had assembled to consider.

Austin Barnes addressed the meeting.

Stephen S. Foster followed with some remarks upon the pro-slavery character of the churches of the land.

Adjourned, to meet at 7 1/2 o'clock, in Union Hall.

FRIDAY EVENING. Met at Union Hall.

During the time was mainly occupied by a speech from Stephen S. Foster, in which he showed, with great ability and clearness, that slavery could be more readily abolished without voting than with it; and that, on the other hand, voting under the United States Constitution is a hindrance to freedom, inasmuch as it is to unite with the slaveholder to support a government, which is the actual slaveholding power, without whose aid it would be utterly impossible that a little knot of slave-owners should be able to hold three millions, and upwards, of men in slavery. Mr. Foster's speech was listened to with close attention and manifest interest.

Adjourned, to meet in the grove at 10, A. M., on Saturday.

The Convention met on Saturday morning. A goodly number was present—the day was fine. The Convention was called to order—a hymn sung. Mr. May read an appropriate passage of Scripture, and proceeded to justify the denunciation of the priest-hood by the abolitionists, by comparing them to the 'reveling wretches described by the prophet Ezekiel.'

The recent priests of the present day, and the priests who devoured the flock of God in the olden time, he showed clearly to be of one blood and similar character.

Mr. Putnam then spoke of the great heartlessness of the age, as evinced in every direction. It is now considered nearly and polite to sneer at the truth of God, and the suffering of the poor and oppressed. He insisted upon the duty of honoring the truth and relieving the oppressed.

Austin Barnes then took the stand. He demonstrated, that with all our boasts of civil and religious freedom, no man could go South and speak his honest sentiments upon oppression and sin. As long as you uphold the cause of war, intemperance and slavery, you may speak, and no longer.

Mr. May read to the meeting the horrible account of the fugitive slave Bolding, and the meeting adjourned till the afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION. E. Thatcher, Esq., in the Chair. A large and most intelligent audience.

Mr. May dissected the Fugitive Slave Law, and showed the base motives of its authors. He proved that it was not simply to get back the few slaves that escaped, but it was passed to insult the anti-slavery sentiment of the North. He made a most convincing speech, developing the policy of the Slave Power.

Mr. Clark, of Sandwich, took the stand. He remarked that the anti-slavery question involved, in itself, the question of right politics, education and true religion—indeed, all that was dear to man was contained in the question of human freedom. There existed in this land a deep-seated error of conscience which was tyranny of the gravest kind. He said, he had ascertained that a deacon, in Dr. Spring's church, New York, had an interest in slaves to the amount of thirty thousand dollars. So, the pro-slavery feelings of Dr. Spring were accounted for; and a minister of his acquaintance had lately received a request to preach some reform sermons, but with the promise that the subject of slavery should not be touched! Reform, indeed! This was the despotism over conscience of which he spoke, and the spirit must be broken, we must have a free religion, before we can be free ourselves or give freedom to the slave. This short, but able address, by Mr. Clark, was listened to with the greatest satisfaction.

At the close of the speech of Mr. Clark, S. S. Foster took the stand, and made a powerful speech upon the sin of the denominations all of which are guilty of the bonds and the blood of the slave. 'It is our duty,' said Mr. F., 'to know no parties or denominations; we simply preach the truth of God, and let it cut its way; beyond this we have no responsibility of the slave, and we shall meet him in peace.' Mr. Foster also explained the story in relation to Parker Pillsbury—commenting severely upon the libel so widely published—viz., that 'Parker Pillsbury, at Danvers, went through the ceremony of taking dogs into the church, in order to outrage the Christian religion; this done, God will hold us guiltless of the blood of the slave.' He explained the forcible illustration used at Danvers by Mr. Pillsbury, commenting upon the

meanness of the *Yarmouth Register*, which, while it greedily published the falsehood, had neglected to publish the correction.

EVENING SESSION. The meeting was held in Union Hall, a fine building, built by the friends of humanity in Harwich, and by them dedicated to free discussion.

The exercises commenced by singing a song of Liberty.

Rev. Mr. MAY spoke of obedience to the laws of the land, and the hue and cry which was made against the men who, without violence, rescued Shadrach—by men who have openly violated all the temperance laws of Mass., and when all national law is violated at the South, when Cuba is invaded, when Northern men are mobbed and murdered by Southern slaveholders, these lovers of law rejoice, and never censure the deed, however mean, bloody, and wicked.

AUSTIN BARNES next spoke upon the wickedness of the nation, living, as it does, by fraud and wrong. He spoke of its rank hypocrisy as a Christian nation, and also made some remarks upon the libel published so extensively upon Parker Pillsbury.

Mr. PUTNAM took the opportunity to contrast the meanness of lying Northern newspaper editors with the comparative honesty even of slaveholders—for while almost all the presses in the free States had published the lie in relation to P. Pillsbury, the Southern slaveholder, who was present at Danvers, and who was denounced to his face by speaker after speaker, on the occasion, yet had the honesty and manliness to write, from Richmond, a letter to the *N. Y. Journal of Commerce*, declaring the entire charge made against Mr. Pillsbury to be false. Mr. P. spoke also upon the growth of the anti-slavery cause, and the hopelessness of all attempts to 'stop the agitation.'

The meeting adjourned, to meet the next morning.

SUNDAY MORNING.

A large concourse of people had assembled in the grove. The bright summer sun and the gentle breeze made the day beautiful. Mr. Garrison had arrived, and the appearance of the great reformer gladdened the eyes and the hearts of the friends of freedom.

The meeting was called to order, and a hymn of liberty went upward on the breeze, and doubtless was an acceptable offering, on that bright Sabbath morn, to the God of Freedom. Mr. Garrison, of the *Infidel*, read an appropriate portion of Scripture.

Rev. S. May, also an 'infidel,' then offered a solemn and impressive prayer for the bondman in his chains and degradation, and prayed also for the guilty nation who thus oppressed the children of God.

The song of the 'Poor Slave Mother' was then sung, and Mr. Garrison took the stand. He read some resolutions adopted to the occasion, and followed with a strong and searching speech. He examined the claims of the professed Christians of the day. 'Slaves,' said he, 'are held by Church members; slaves are sold by Church members; slaves are sold to advance the interests of theological institutions and the cause of missions to the heathen! They withhold the word of God from three millions of immortal men. Can these men be Christians, who thus withhold the word of God? We have no controversy with these churches, as churches, or with political parties, as such, but we claim that all men are bound to exert themselves for the immediate abolition of slavery. Yet we find the clergy and churches most active in the work of oppression, and the great political parties also.

Samuel May, Jr., followed Mr. Garrison, in a short speech. He remarked that the settlement of the slavery question determines whether we are entitled to be called, in any sense, a Christian people, or whether we stand up a nation of atheists; and he called upon all to follow the example of the Apostles, and 'obey God rather than man.'

Mr. Nickerson, of Harwich, made a few sensible remarks upon the importance of doing duty individually; of being always alive to our individual responsibility. He read from the *Oberlin Evangelist* some account of the recent Chicago Convention, and the complaint of the writer that their opponents called them 'Infidels.'

Mr. Garrison spoke of this wincing under the cry of 'Infidel' exhibited by the *Oberlin Evangelist*, and remarked that that paper had long been in the habit of making the same cry against the 'old organization.' He and his friends had been often branded by that paper as 'Infidels,' because of their devotion to the slave. Now, the poisoned chalice was commended to their own lips, and how they winced under it! Did the Chicago Convention dream that they could take any ground against slavery, and the churches and priesthood of the land not cry 'Infidel! Infidel!' You must be a positive friend of oppression, if you wish to escape the cry of 'Infidel!'—No man can be a true friend of the slave, and be held in the slightest regard by the friends of slavery. You must give up body and soul to it, or take the denunciations of the churches, priesthood, press, and politicians of the land.

Mr. Foster made some remarks to the same point, and the Convention adjourned to the afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION. The audience had much increased. It was a pleasant night. There, to hear the truth upon the great question of human freedom, were assembled hundreds of the men and women of the Cape. Breaking away from the thralldom of sect and party, they came to hear and think for themselves, to cultivate the sentiments of humanity. Hunkerdom sent a few representatives also, restless and wretched; scornful and hating. A few things, shaped like men, moved around, to listen, and see, with dismay, glowing brighter and brighter, that flame of humanity which shall consume them and the great system of wickedness which they seek to sustain. A hymn was sung.

Mr. GARRISON again took up the churches for examination, and gave the statistics showing their guilt, and alluded to the fact that the ministers and churches held this hour more than five hundred millions of dollars worth of slaves. Is it a matter of surprise, then, that these churches and ministers, and the churches who commune with them, should oppose the anti-slavery movement. He showed the guilt of the American people to transcend beyond comparison the guilt of the Jewish nation in the murder of Jesus and the Prophets. Mr. Garrison also alluded to the libel upon Mr. Pillsbury, and explained the whole matter, commenting upon the wickedness of the American press, which so greedily published the slander, and said, with truth, 'Parker Pillsbury is a man of whom America is not worthy. If any man is making his mark upon the age, it is Parker Pillsbury. If any man is in this day raised above the fear of God which bringeth a snare and is faithful to God and humanity, it is the victim of this libel, Parker Pillsbury.' Mr. Garrison's speech was a very powerful exposition of the sad condition of the country, and the causes which have led to it.

Mr. FOSTER took the stand, and spoke at length upon the guilt of the American Government, as seen in the defenceless and utterly helpless condition of the female slave population, and the corruption which is consequent upon this state of things. He spoke of the clergyman of the South, who preach on the Sabbath, and sell their brother church members. He made also some touching remarks upon the horrible system of separating mothers from their children—husbands from their wives. Mr. Foster stated also a

remark of Dr. Channing to Abby K. Foster, that he feared that the time might come when the Northern poor white working men might be sold as slaves to the aristocracy! This was a startling announcement, coming from the lips of the cautious and far-seeing Channing.

Mr. GARRISON made a short, but effective speech, in which he compared Daniel Webster to Judas Iscariot, very much to the advantage of the latter.

Thanks, on behalf of the speakers and other visitors, were given by S. May, Jr., to the Harwich friends, for their kindness and hospitality, and the meeting adjourned. The large concourse exchanged farewells and separated to their homes. We all felt that a strong blow for freedom had been struck, and that God would bless the efforts made for the redemption of the slave.

A collection of forty dollars, for expenses of meeting, and in aid of the cause, was taken up by the Financial Committee.

Among those whose efficient labors and generous hospitality the success of this Convention is greatly owing, we must name JOSHUA H. ROBBINS, ZEBINA H. SMALL, NATHANIEL ROBBINS, GILBERT SMITH, ISAAC MAYO, and their respective families. We wish, too, to acknowledge the liberality of Mr. HIRAM BEARE in giving the use of his carriage to convey the agents forward from Hyannis to Falmouth, twenty-two miles, on Monday morning. The kindness and aid of many others is not forgotten. Barnstable county has too much manliness and generosity of character to be an appendage and vassal of the slaveholders. May she soon wash her hands of the polluting connection!

EZEKIEL THATCHER, President.

SAMUEL MAY, JR., Secretary.

GEORGE W. PUTNAM, Secretary.

On Monday evening, Mr. Garrison and Mr. May held a meeting at Falmouth, and Mr. Foster and Mr. Putnam a meeting at Hyannis.

Messrs. May, Garrison, and Foster, have gone to Nantucket.

G. W. P.

The following are the Resolutions referred to above as having been offered by Mr. Garrison and subsequently adopted.

1. Resolved, That with more than three millions of slaves in our midst, crying ceaselessly to God for deliverance—denied by law all the means of education and moral improvement, prohibited from all access to the Bible, deprived of every right which distinguishes man from the brute creation, and registered with cattle, swine, and household furniture—the pretence of this nation to reverence and observe the first day of the week as the Lord's day or the Christian Sabbath, is led off on a farce and daring impiety.

2. Resolved, That until this nation abolishes its worse than heathenish slave system, its prayers, its praises, its rites and ceremonies, its public worship, its solemn assemblies, are all an abomination to Him, who, being no respecter of persons, requires mercy rather than sacrifice, and prefers obedience to the offering of incense.

3. Resolved, That the message which the faithful witness for God must bring to the people of this land is as direct and unqualified as was that which the prophets of old were commissioned to bring to the Jewish nation—the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint; from the sole of the foot even to the crown of the head, there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores—none calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth; they trust in vanity, and speak lies; they conceive mischief, and bring forth iniquity; their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood; wasting and destruction are in their paths; judgment is turned backward, and justice standeth afar off; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey.

4. Resolved, That all objections to the principles and measures of the Abolitionists proceed either from ignorance, misconception, prejudice, selfishness, cowardice, hypocrisy, or knavery; that they demand nothing for the slave but what is reasonable and just, in exact accordance with the Bill of Rights of Massachusetts and the Declaration of Independence, and required by the gospel of Christ; that the real difficulty is, hatred and contempt for an injured race on account of their complexion, the great unpopularity of the anti-slavery cause, and the terrible supremacy of the slave power, by which religion and politics, public sentiment, station, wealth, influence, commerce, and manufactures, have been subjugated and made subservient to its demoniacal purposes.

5. Resolved, That the struggle for the abolition of slavery in this country is a struggle for the preservation of our own liberties, as well as for the emancipation of those in bonds—a struggle for the unobstructed circulation of the Bible, the existence and extension of the gospel, the prevalence of universal justice and purity, the sanctity of the marriage institution, the recognition of man as an equal and accountable being—a struggle for the peace, prosperity, safety, and true union of every portion of the republic.

6. Resolved, therefore, That no man has any claim to be regarded as either a patriot or a Christian, who is not an out-spoken and uncompromising Abolitionist.

PALMOUTH.

This town ought to be particularly noticed, for it possesses a reputation in one respect, quite singular. It is said that no anti-slavery lecture had ever been given in it, and no meeting specially devoted to the anti-slavery question had ever been held in it, down to Monday last, the first day of September, A. D., 1851. The whole twenty years of the anti-slavery struggle had rolled over, and their thrilling excitement, various fortune, and many noble victories won, but Pالمouth had never mingled in the contest for liberty. Satisfied with politics which sacrificed every thing good to the slaveholders forever, subject to a religion which taught them conformity to cruel and wicked laws, and which heaped reproach upon the friends of the slave, the people of Pالمouth have not still been dumb, so far as the slavery of their own countrymen goes, and thought it enough to look out for their own aggrandizement, not so scrupulous whence their wealth came. Many years ago, a lecturer attempted to speak on slavery, but every hall and public place was closed against him, and a private house offered for his use, was surrounded by a mob, who threatened to tear it down, if the lecturer was allowed to speak in it.

On the evening above named, (Monday last), an anti-slavery meeting was held in the Town Hall, Falmouth, by those representing the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. The change which has come over the face of the whole land within the past fifteen years, had so far reached Pالمouth, that the selection of the town granted the use of the Hall, to be occupied by Mr. Garrison and Mr. May, for an anti-slavery meeting, free of expense. For this courteous and obliging act, the speakers, in behalf of their cause, tender to the Falmouth selectmen their sincere thanks. The short space which can be devoted to an evening meeting, we believe, was used in a most judicious, faithful, and useful manner. Mr. Garrison gave, to a very attentive audience of about one hundred persons, an admirably lucid sketch of the nature and working of slavery, and what the abolitionists have been doing, and what all the nation ought to be doing, to bring it to an end. It was a very complete and unanswerable view of slavery and its enormities, and our duty in the premises. Samuel May, Jr., contrasted the position of the European monarchies, at the Mahometan powers of Tunis and Turkey, of the Catholic country of Mexico, &c., in abolishing slavery and the slave-trade, while the free,

enlightened, Christian United States of America are hugging it closer, extending it wider, and making its perpetuation, in the words of John Quincy Adams the vital and animating spirit of their national government! He showed how the Northern political parties, and the Northern churches, are (on their own showing) justifying this wickedness, and making new compromises with it. He appealed to the audience to come forward to the aid of this struggling but most righteous cause.

During Mr. May's speech, WENDELL PHILLIPS most unexpectedly entered the Hall, and closed the meeting with some remarks in which he showed how worthy the American Anti-Slavery Society, with its branches, is of the respect and support of all. Its works are seen everywhere; it has aroused this sleeping and guilty land; it has triumphantly carried many important posts; and it is now the only body in the land distinctly carrying on a genuine, undiluted anti-slavery work.

Falmouth is nearly dead, anti-slavery-wise. But, with faithful labor, it may yet be reanimated and made alive. Late to take up the anti-slavery cross—the only cross of Christ in this age and country—may she soon be among the foremost and most valiant of the anti-slavery host!

The friends were kindly received under the roof of Mr. Hewins.—M.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE WESTERN A. S. SOCIETY.

DEAR FRIEND GARRISON:

For the past three days, we have been holding the annual meeting of the W. A. S. Society, at Mount Union, in the county of Stark. I would give you some description of the scenes of this occasion were it in my power. I have attended two or three of these meetings before; but in point of numbers, interest, fidelity, boldness and ability, no one ever exceeded this. On Sunday, the concourse of people was greater than I ever witnessed at any anti-slavery meeting before. The immense pavilion under which it was held, more than 100 feet in diameter, was thronged in every part, while, as many estimated, not less than 2000 people stood around outside. I have attended meetings here before that were reported as having brought full 5000 people together—but it seemed to me more than ever over-estimated. In this instance, however, I think we exceeded that number. And the meeting was held, too, in the midst of a population where houses are very few and far between. There was not a town that would, in New England, be called large, within almost fifty miles. It was interesting in the cause that brought the people together on foot, on horse back, by rail road, steamboat, and canal packet, and in vehicles of almost every conceivable kind, some of them more than a hundred miles. It was good to be there.

The following are a part of the Resolutions:

Resolved, That we are not merely warring against the extension of slavery, nor against any Fugitive Slave Law, constitutional or unconstitutional—nor for the writ of Habeas Corpus, or the right of jury trial for recaptured slaves—but we are waging eternal warfare against the doctrine, that man can ever, under any possibility of circumstances, hold property in man.

Resolved, That any political party that will hold union with slaveholders at all, or recognize them as having any rights whatever, more than felons or pirates, is an utter denial of the fundamental doctrines of justice and liberty, and a daring rebellion against the government of the universe.

Resolved, That the Free Soil party welcomes the slaveholder to the governmental platform, with all his crimes—it recognizes his right to enslave millions of his own equal brethren—it says to him, we are bound to you by most sacred ties, which we will always respect—and we will ever sustain the Union, 'forever united,' and however extended by fraud and falsehood towards the Indians, or the wretched, wretched millions of thousands upon thousands of Mexicans—we will continue true and loyal to that Union, as we have ever been, though Cuba, St. Domingo, and all Mexico, swell its bloody triumphs, and all their soil be consecrated to the curse and crimes of slavery.

Resolved, That though we rejoice in the changes of public opinion, which are seen in the partial success of the Free Soil party, we are still mindful that whoever holds office in the U. S. government, is a sworn supporter of the Constitutional voice and action of the majority in this confederacy of plunderers and enslavers of their fellow-men—whatever that voice and action may be; whether it be to seize and subdue new spoils from Mexico or other nations, or to carve that already plundered into new and numberless slave States; and while that party is shouting ever its occasional, 'though uncertain victories, we will still, over and above its triumphant exultations, continue to pour our all-conquering motto—'No Union with slaveholders nor slavery.'

I think the discussions on these resolutions will not soon be forgotten. James W. Walker was in his best mood, and Charles C. Burleigh certainly at times outdid himself; while others, perhaps less known, catching the inspiration of the scene, were borne onward in strains of natural eloquence which reached the hearts of many, to whom the words of truth have been a savor of death unto death.

The Free Soil opposition came upon the ground in full strength, determined to give us battle. But the character of our resolutions was such as to commend themselves, undisputed, to the understanding and conscience of every unprejudiced person who heard them, and there was really no room for such argument on the other side. Rev. Mr. Brisbane was on the platform throughout, and though at times dissenting, showed himself a man, in all the best sense of the word. It seemed to some of us that he could not much longer remain outside of our extreme anti-slavery doctrines. He instanced several contingencies, (very likely to happen, too,) which he said, sooner than they should come, he would see the Union dashed in a thousand fragments; and if he should see the Free Soil party in certain positions, (which we think they must inevitably take,) he declared, with great emphasis, he would shake off the dust of his feet against them. He said he was indebted to the American Anti-Slavery Society and its champions for much, and he honored that Society. He said it had taught the ministers how to preach, and what to preach, and he rejoiced that he could co-operate with it so far as he could. You know he was a slaveholder once, and made himself poor by his repentance; and his demeanor on our platform gave evidence of deep sincerity, and a readiness to labor any where to accomplish his object. His course contrasted singularly enough with most Northern men who at times have been reluctantly constrained to appear in our discussions.

I wish I could give you some idea of Western hospitality on these anniversary occasions. Henry C. Wright has made our mouths water a hundred times with descriptions and catalogues of the good things they have to eat, but he could not describe the way the thing is done. Such a thing as going to a tavern is scarcely known. I have attended many of these thronging meetings, when there was not a tavern within half a dozen miles and more, nor, indeed, but few houses of any kind. At this meeting, I lodged at the house of a most worthy farmer by the name of Pierce Garrison. His house, though two stories high, was small; but on Sunday night, he entertained with food and lodging over sixty persons, besides infants. There were more than twenty carriages, more than half of which had two horses each. A part of the rooms were occupied by men, the rest by women. Straw beds and mattresses were laid on the floor, touching each other, on two sides of some of the rooms, and so made as to be beds (like some of the omnibuses) 'for twelve persons.' In this way, sixty per-

sons and more, beside the family, were comfortably lodged, as well as most sumptuously fed, and all without any more apparent trouble than we are accustomed to see in families of more Eastern dimensions. It seems as if the houses were made of some charmed material, capable of extending to receive all who come. The abundance and cheapness of provisions here make such an entertainment far less expensive than with us in New England; but the cause owes much to this hospitality, while the social and kindly feeling, and acquaintance with abolitionists from different and distant places, which arise from it, make it one of the most desirable virtues to be encouraged and inculcated.

There is not so much money here as at the East, and contributions are not yet in proportion to the number attending the meetings. Still, in this respect, there is rapid improvement. Let but half the mighty works be done in Ohio and the West that have been done in Massachusetts, and there will be a harvest of both faith and works, such as would bear comparison with the most fruitful field in all the anti-slavery heritage.

Yours most truly,

PARKER PILLSBURY.

Salem, Ohio, Aug. 27th, 1851.

DISCHARGE OF THE SLAVE DANIEL DAVIS.

The Buffalo Commercial Advertiser, of Saturday, confirms the telegraphic report of the discharge of the slave Daniel, who was brought before Judge Conkling on a writ of habeas corpus. The following are the principal points of Judge Conkling's argument:

'The language of the 10th section of the act is this: 'And he it further enacted, That when any person held to service or labor, in any State or Territory, or in the District of Columbia, shall escape therefrom, the party to whom such service or labor is due, his heirs, or their agent or attorney, may apply to any Court of record therein, or Judge thereof in vacation, and make satisfactory proof, &c.'

Now, it is insisted that this provision is clearly prospective, and therefore inapplicable to the case of an escape from labor or service occurring before the passage of the act; and such, I am constrained to say, appears to me to be the plain sense of the enactment. It was agreed by the Counsel for the claimant that this being a remedial act, it is to be construed as to suppress the mischief, and advance the remedy; and that it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been more explicitly declared, by the addition, immediately after the word 'shall,' of the words 'hereafter,' or the words, 'and that if it can be reasonably inferred from its whole tenor, that the provision in question was designed to act retrospectively, it is to be so interpreted. But when the language of a statute is unambiguous, and leads to no absurdity or palpable injustice, it is to be construed according to its natural import.'

It may be conceded that the legislative intent imported by the words used might have been



